UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/702,380	10/31/2000	Edward P. Maher	10992667-1	2250

7590 08/11/2006

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P O Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
ROGERS, SCOTT A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/702,380	EDWARD P. MAHER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott A. Rogers	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 April 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☒ Other: *Detailed Action (p. 2-11)*.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments in the Appeal Brief filed 21 April 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-19 under 35 USC 103, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the final rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made below in view of Suzuki et al (US 4882621) and Paulson (US 2002/0069956A1), and other prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al (US 4882621) in view of Paulson (US 2002/0069956A1).

Referring to claim 1:

Suzuki et al disclose an inkjet printing device 100 for printing images [not an identification card per se], comprising:

an input area for holding transparent media (col. 3, lines 36-49 and col. 5, lines 16-22)

a processor (circuit 4) configured to receive input images [not that define the identification card per se] and to translate and transpose the input images into reverse images (col. 2, lines 41-48); and

an inkjet printhead 49 (in image forming portion 13 of image output portion 104) coupled to the processor (circuit 4) and configured to receive and print the reverse images on portions of the transparent media (col. 2, lines 49-59 and col. 3, lines 36-49 and col. 5, lines 26-32).

While Suzuki et al do not disclose producing an identification card per se, Paulson discloses in the background discussion the production of identification cards with a transparent material laminated over a substrate. (see paragraph 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have applied the method of producing an image as taught by the Suzuki et al to the production of identification cards, in view of Paulson, in order to produce a high quality image with gloss on an image surface which is protected by a transparent layer (see col. 1, lines 44-50 in Suzuki et al and paragraph 3 in Paulson).

Referring to claim 2:

Suzuki et al do not disclose that the transparent media is a roll of polyester media. However, Paulson discloses that transparent laminate 12 is provided on a roll (supply spool) and is preferably a polyester film (see paragraphs 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a roll of polyester media as the transparent media in Suzuki et al, in view of Paulson, in order to provide a low cost and readily available material of high durability.

Referring to claim 3:

Suzuki et al disclose the transparent media coated with a material to absorb and control the amount of ink spread to allow the dispensed ink to remain on the transparent media (col. 3, lines 9-15).

Referring to claim 4:

Suzuki et al do not disclose each printed portion of the transparent media laminated to a plastic card, the side of the transparent media containing the images being adhered to the card. However, Paulson discloses laminating an overlaminate 10 (cut from transparent laminate 12) for use in laminating (adhering) to identification card substrates such as plastic cards (see paragraph 3 and paragraph 19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have laminated the printed portion of the transparent media to a plastic card in Suzuki et al, in view of Paulson, in order to protect the image surface with a transparent layer (see col. 1, lines 44-50 in Suzuki et al and paragraph 3 in Paulson).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al and Paulson as applied to claims 1-4 above, and further in view of well known prior art.

Referring to claim 5:

While Paulson does not disclose the use of an adhesive tape per se to laminate the transparent media to a card, the use of such adhesive tape is well known in the prior art (note US classification class 156, subclass 540).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Suzuki et al and Paulson combination, in view of the well known prior art, to have used an adhesive tape to laminate the transparent media to a card in order to provide a low cost and readily available adhesive material for laminating the transparent media to a card.

Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al, Paulson, and well known prior art, as applied to claims 1-5 above, and further in view of Oshikoshi (US 4769694A).

Referring to claim 6:

While the Suzuki et al and Paulson combination do not specifically disclose images including a photographic image as well as alphanumeric data of an individual, it is well understood in the prior art that identification cards or badges, driver licenses, and the like comprise both a photographic image as well as alphanumeric data of an individual. Oshikoshi, already of record, provides an example of this in the description of the composite image formed on the printing paper 20 to produce identification cards 23.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Suzuki et al and Paulson combination, in view of Oshikoshi, to have produced images including a photographic image as well as alphanumeric data of an individual for the production of identification cards as taught by Oshikoshi in order for the identification

card to have personal identification information of the individual cardholder associated with their picture to allow the cardholder to prove their identity (see col. 1, lines 11-17).

Referring to claim 7:

While the Suzuki et al and Paulson combination do not teach the laminated plastic card automatically being cut by the printing device as an identification card, Oshikoshi discloses printing paper 20 being automatically cut by the printing device into print sheets 23 from which is created identification cards (col. 7, lines 57-66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Suzuki et al and Paulson combination, in view of Oshikoshi, to have automatically cut laminated plastic cards in order to achieve higher and more accurate production runs compared to manual operation. Automation of production practices and the advantages derived therefrom are common knowledge in the art.

Referring to claim 8:

Suzuki et al do not disclose a hot air dryer to dry the images on the transparent media. However, it is well known in the prior art to dry the images printed on a medium. before lamination.

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Suzuki et al and Paulson combination, in view of the well known prior art, to have used a hot air dryer to dry the images on the transparent media, inherently before the transparent media is laminated to a plastic card, in order to allow lamination to occur properly in a high speed production process.

Referring to claim 9:

Paulson discloses in the background discussion the lamination of transparent media to plastic cards, although does not specifically indicate that this is done automatically. However, it is well understood in the prior art that machines, which produce identification cards, perform many automated steps. This is evidenced for example by Oshikoshi. To include the lamination as an automatic step in the production of identity cards would be obvious.

It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Suzuki et al and Paulson combination, in view of the well known prior art, to have automatically laminated the transparent media to plastic cards in order to achieve higher and more accurate production runs compared to manual operation. As stated before, automation of production practices and the advantages derived therefrom are common knowledge in the art.

Referring to claim 10:

Paulson discloses a die cut 16A to automatically cut the overlaminate 10 from the web 12. While this is not cutting a laminated plastic card into the identification card, automatically cutting material to form an identification card is well known in the prior art as evidenced by Oshikoshi.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the Suzuki et al and Paulson combination, in view of Oshikoshi, to have used any conventional cutting device, such as a die cut, that allows the laminated plastic card to automatically cut into the identification card in order. Using a conventional cutting

device in the automated production of identification cards reduces the cost and difficulty in providing, servicing, and replacing the part.

Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al in view of Paulson and Oshikoshi.

Referring to claim 11:

Suzuki et al disclose a method of producing an image [not an identification card per se] using a processor of a host computer 101 coupled to an inkjet printhead 49 (in image forming portion 13 of image output portion 104) of an inkjet printing device 100 comprising:

creating a digital file on the host computer 101 having images [not specified as including both images and text per se] (col. 2, lines 19-20);

translating and transposing [not with the processor in host computer 101, but with circuit 4 in output portion 104] the images to define reversed data (col. 2, lines 41-48);

sending the reversed data (from circuit 4 via color correction circuit 8) to an inkjet printhead 49 (in image forming portion 13 of image output portion 104) to be printed by the inkjet printing device 100 (col. 2, lines 49-59 and col. 3, lines 36-49) that includes an input area for holding transparent media (col. 5, lines 16-22); and

printing the reversed data on a portion of the transparent media with the inkjet printhead (col. 5, lines 26-32).

While Suzuki et al and Paulson do not disclose producing an identification card including both images and text, it is clear from Oshikoshi that production of such an identification card in this manner is known in the prior art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have applied the method of producing an image as taught by the Suzuki et al and Paulson combination, to the production of identification cards including both a photographic image and alphanumeric data of an individual, as taught by Oshikoshi, in order for the identification card to have personal identification information of the individual cardholder associated with their picture and thereby allow the cardholder to prove their identity (see col. 1, lines 11-17).

While Suzuki et al do not disclose performing the translating and transposing with a processor in host computer, it is well known in the prior art to perform processing on image data prior to output to a printer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Suzuki et al, in view of the well known prior art, to have included performing the translating and transposing with a processor in the host computer in order to allow the use of a conventional computer which can be programmed and/or operated to perform all required image processing and eliminate the cost and complexity of providing this processing to be performed by the printer. Moreover, the computer allows easy program modification, updating, and adaptation of the image processing operations compared to changing circuitry in the printer.

Referring to claims 12-14:

Method claims 12-14 corresponding, respectively, to the function of apparatus claims 2-4. These method claims are rejected for the same reasons as indicated above with respect to the function of corresponding apparatus claims.

Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al, Paulson, and Oshikoshi, as applied to claims 11-14 above, and further in view of well known prior art.

Referring to claims 15-19:

Method claims 15-19 correspond, respectively, to the function of apparatus claims 5 and 7-10. These method claims are rejected for the same reasons as indicated above with respect to the function of corresponding apparatus claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott A Rogers whose telephone number is 571-272-7467. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Moore can be reached at 571-272-7437.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to TC2600 Customer Service at 571-272-2600. Official correspondence by facsimile should be sent to 571-273-8300. The USPTO contact Center phone numbers are 800-PTO-9199.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

04 August 2006

SCOTT ROGERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600